

## **REMARKS**

The present filing is responsive to the Office Action.

### **Summary of the Response**

Claims 3, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claims 12 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 2 have been previously canceled. Claims 3-11 and 14-22 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application as amended are respectfully requested.

### **Prior Drawing Changes**

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to note in the record entry of the drawing changes previously presented in Applicant's prior response.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102**

Claims 1-9 and 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (US 6,501,456). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the claims as amended.

Claim 13 has been rewritten into independent form, by amending claim 3 to include all of the limitations of claims 12 and 13. Entry of the present amendments to claim 3 is proper after final, since no new issue has been raised requiring further search.

Claim 13 as amended recites a first voltage line group, a second voltage line group and a third voltage line group, wherein a second voltage line that belongs to the first voltage line group and is adjacent to the second voltage line group is supplied with a voltage through a second

relaying line, and a fourth voltage line that belongs to the second voltage line group and is adjacent to the third voltage line group is supplied with a voltage through an additional relaying line. In other words, the last voltage line in the first voltage line group and the last voltage line in the second voltage line group are supplied with voltages through different relaying lines. This recited voltage supply circuit structure is supported by the original disclosure of the present application at [41] to [69] and Figs. 3 and 4.

Applicant respectfully submits that Saito fails to disclose the features noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that the recited relaying lines and voltage lines are all different physical lines (each line is labeled with a reference numeral in claim 3, in reference to the embodiment illustrated in Fig. 3, for example). Given that the relaying lines and voltage lines are all different physical lines, in order for Saito to be able to anticipate the voltage supply circuit structure recited in claim 3, the Examiner must therefore point to where in Saito lies the different lines corresponding to the recited relaying lines and voltage lines. In the present action, the Examiner referred to the timing chart shown in Fig. 14 in Saito, and asserted  $GS(2n-1)$ ,  $GS(2n)$  and  $GS(2n+1)$  correspond to three different recited voltage lines. Even assuming for the time being that this is true, the Examiner however failed to show additional lines corresponding to the recited physical relaying lines. The timing diagram of Fig. 14, without more, would not be sufficient to be relied upon to show the various physical relaying lines in the recited voltage supply circuit structure, and much less the specific structural relationship between the various physical voltage and relaying lines. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to point out the additional physical lines in Saito that may be deemed to correspond to the recited relaying lines in addition to voltage lines.

Accordingly, claim 3 as amended (previously submitted claim 13) is not anticipated by Saito.

Independent claims 15 and 16 have been similarly amended based on similar limitations. Claims 15 and 16 as amended are likewise not anticipated by Saito for the same reasons noted above.

Consequently, all dependent claims are also patentable over Saito. Additionally, the dependent claims recite further limitations that further distinguish from Saito.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Given the traversal of independent claim 3 above, the rejections of claims 10 and 11 are rendered moot. Claims 10 and 11 recite further limitations that further distinguish from Saito.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of all the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims pending in this application are patentable over the references of record and are in condition for allowance. Such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. **The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative to discuss any outstanding issues that may not have been adequately addressed in this response.**

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this transmittal and associated documents, or

to credit any overpayment to **Deposit Account No. 501288** referencing the attorney docket number of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Wen Liu, Reg. No. 32,822/

Dated: April 18, 2011

---

Wen Liu  
Registration No. 32,822

LIU & LIU  
444 S. Flower Street; Suite 1750  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 830-5743  
Facsimile: (213) 830-5741  
Email: wliu@liulaw.com